

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added, canceled or amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-21 and 23-25 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-13, 15 and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,742,141 to Miller; and 2, 4, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Null (Null, Linda, “The Essentials of Computer Organization and Architecture”). These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that column 19, lines 40-42, lines 57-58, and column 19, line 64 to column 20, line 18 of Miller teaches the transmission of missing events in a central repository from a computer system during a synchronizing step. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In more detail, column 19, lines 40-42 of Miller describes that if a problem cannot be solved by a technical at a central site, the technician can use the customer site software to attempt to solve the problem at the customer site remotely. Such features that allow the technician to remotely log into the computer and thus to try to solve a problem with that remote computer, has nothing at all to do with the remote computer transmitting a missing event in its local repository to a central repository. Note that the technician has the ‘event’ already, and is trying to resolve it, and so there is no disclosure in this portion of Miller as to the technician receiving another ‘event’ missing from his/her computer as provided from the customer site computer.

Column 19, lines 57-58 of Miller describes a remote support feature shown in Figure 22 of Miller, whereby, for the same reasoning as provided above, this remote support features has nothing at all to do with the technician receiving a “missing event” from a customer site computer for which he/she is trying to fix. None of the steps shown in Figure 22 of Miller corresponds to a synchronizing of information from a customer computer with information from a technician’s computer, whereby the customer computer sends missing event information to the technician’s computer after such synchronizing. Rather, a secure link is established between the technician’s computer and the customer computer (see step 441), and the technician examines state information in order to diagnose a problem with the customer computer.

Also, column 19, line 64 to column 20, line 18 of Miller describes features by which the technician can cause the customer site software to access requested state information and to return its value to the technician at the central repository. Again, this has nothing at all to do with the technician receiving a “missing event” from a customer site computer for which he/she is trying to fix. **No synchronization between the customer site computer and the technician’s computer** is disclosed or suggested in this portion of Miller.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action, its argues that the updating of a log in a master knowledge base meets the specific features recited in the independent claims. However, this is not the case, since the updating of a log based on new information provided from a customer site does not disclose or suggest the synchronizing of information from the customer site with information at a technician site, but rather it just signifies that the log information at the technician site is updated whenever new log information is provided to it, whereby this is done without any synchronization, since Miller does not disclose or suggest the need to synchronize information between two locations. Note that the synchronizing takes up transmission bandwidth, and thus it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have done this, since Miller clearly feels that his system does not require such over-use of transmission bandwidth.

Accordingly, since Null does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Miller, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Presently pending independent claims 12 and 21 recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to presently pending independent claim 1, and thus those claims are also patentable over the cited art of record.

The presently pending dependent claims are patentable due to their respective dependencies on either base claim 1, 12 or 21, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims. For example, dependent claim 10 recites that the synchronizing step comprises discarding events that have already been received. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 18, lines 5-10 of Miller teaches these features. Rather, column 18, lines 5-10 of Miller describes that a list of entries is transmitted to a configuration analyzer, which compares it to a list generated of the customer knowledge base extraction, and uses the incremental update generator to package the set of changes needed from the master knowledge base. There is no teaching or suggestion in this portion of Miller as to discarding of any entry list information (or any other information for that matter).

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it asserts that since Miller teaches using an incremental update, this signifies discarding of events that have already been received. Applicant respectfully disagrees, since all this means is that Miller sends less information from one location to another location, whereby the incremental updating of information does not correspond to discarding of any information. That is, if information "A1B2C3D4" was sent from computer 1 to computer 2, and then computer 1 sent D5 to computer 2, this does not mean that computer 2 then discards the already received information "A1B2C3", but rather it means that computer 2 modifies the information "A1B2C3D4" to "A1B2C3D5".

Accordingly, dependent claim 10 is patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for its base claim 1.

Still further, with respect to the rejection of dependent claims 23-25, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 20, lines 3-17 of Miller teaches the features recited in those claims. Rather, column 20, lines 3-17 of Miller describes that a technician can choose to use an engine primitive that will cause the customer site software to call a primitive, and to return results for review by the technician. The customer site software implements the chosen action, and the server software records the action and its results in a log, and then the process returns to handle the next action. Again, like the arguments made above, no synchronization

is performed in the system of Miller, but rather a technician sequentially analyzes problems of a customer site computer by choosing engine primitives to cause the customer site computer to perform particular actions, and once those actions have been made and logged, the entire log is available for review to create a new entry in a master knowledge base to handle a particular problem. In more detail, "system failure events for which causes were still being determined by the computer system at a time when the central repository made a request" does not occur in the system of Miller, but rather "system failure events for which causes are to be determined by the computer system at a time when the central repository made a request" occurs in the system of Miller. This time distinction is important, and results in a totally different operating system of the invention of claims 23-25 as compared to the system of Miller.

Accordingly, dependent claims 23-25 are patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 21, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819